

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 270212

44

ORIGIN NEA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ABF-01 AGR-05 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00

DOT-00 EB-07 EPA-01 HEW-02 HUD-01 INR-07 INT-05

LOC-01 NASA-01 NSAE-00 NSF-01 OMB-01 OES-03 SMI-01

TRSE-00 FS-01 AID-05 CU-02 L-03 SP-02 OPIC-03 /064 R

DRAFTED BY NEA/INS:RBMORLEY/DKUX:EI

APPROVED BY OES:MKRATZER

OES/SCI/BMP:ARICHMOND

NEA:ADUBS

OES/APT - DR. GANLEY

----- 023650

R 141735Z NOV 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY NEW DELHI

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 270212

E.O. 11652:GDS

TAGS: USINJC, TECH, IN, US

SUBJECT: SCIENCE COOPERATION WITH THE INDIANS: S & T SUB-COMMISSION AND RUPEE-SUPPORT RESEARCH

REF: NEW DELHI 14387

1. SUMMARY: REFTTEL RAISES SEVERAL QUESTIONS REGARDING THE S & T SUBCOMMISSION, INDIAN WILLINGNESS TO DEFEND PROJECTS AGAINST CRITICISM AND THE HANDLING OF SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY FUNDED RESEARCH PROGRAMS IN LIGHT OF MRS. GANDHI'S CRITICISM. WE THINK THE GOI HAS GIVEN US A COMMITMENT TO DEFEND PROPERLY APPROVED SCIENCE PROJECTS AGAINST UNFAIR CRITICISM. WE WISH THE PROCESSING OF USG FUNDED RUPEE RESEARCH TO CONTINUE ACCORDING TO ESTABLISHED ROUTINE. END SUMMARY.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 270212

2. IT IS PERHAPS INEVITABLE THAT THERE WILL BE SOME LACK OF CLARITY AT THIS POINT ABOUT THE FUNCTIONING OF THE S & T SUBCOMMISSION. BECAUSE OF DELAYS ON BOTH SIDES IT HAS NOT YET DEVELOPED AS CLEAR-CUT A MODUS OPERANDI AS THE OTHER TWO SUBCOMMISSIONS. WE WOULD HOPE THAT THIS WILL BE RESOLVED BY THE UPCOMING MEETING. WE SEE THE S & T SUBCOMMISSION AS PROVIDING A BILATERAL UMBRELLA OVER ALL INTER-GOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE COOPERATION(EXCEPT FOR NUCLEAR AND

AND MOST SPACE QUESTIONS). THUS, WE DO NOT AGREE WITH THE DISTINCTION THE INDIANS MAY BE MAKING BETWEEN RESEARCH CARRIED OUT ON THE "AEGIS OF THE JOINT COMMISSION" AND OTHER COOPERATIVE VENTURES SUCH AS THE RUPEE FUNDED RESEARCH. IF THIS REPRESENTS A GENUINE PROBLEM RATHER THAN A SEMANTIC DIFFERENCE, WE ARE READY TO DISCUSS THE QUESTION AT THE UPCOMING SUBCOMMISSION MEETING.

3. IN THIS CONTEXT, WE ARE PRETTY WELL SET FOR THE NEXT MEETING AS WE AGREED WITH NAG CHAUDHURI THAT IT SHOULD FOCUS ON FIRING UP JOINT PROJECTS IN THE PRIORITY AREAS CHALKED OUT AT LAST JANUARY'S SUBCOMMISSION MEETING. WE AGREE WE SHOULD NOT GENERALLY TAKE THE LEAD IN PROPOSING THAT THE SUBCOMMISSION MOVE OFF IN NEW DIRECTIONS, BUT SHOULD LEAVE THE INITIATIVE TO THE INDIANS. WE DO NOT, HOWEVER, WANT TO BE LEFT WITH INADEQUATE PREPARATION DUE TO SHORT LEAD TIME THAT COULD BE AVOIDED THROUGH TIMELY AND FOR THE MOST PART INFORMAL CONTACTS WITH INDIAN AGENCIES. IN ORDER TO MAKE THE MOST OF THE TIME AVAILABLE, WE HAVE ASKED USG AGENCIES TO RESPOND TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE TO THE SETS OF GOI PROPOSALS ALREADY IN HAND AND HAVE ENCOURAGED THEM TO WORK WITH INDIAN AGENCIES WHERE POSSIBLE TO REFINE THESE. THE "NORMALIZATION" OF US/INDIA RELATIONS SIGNALLED BY THE JOINT COMMISSION MEETING DOES NOT PUT THE TOTAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR INITIATIVES ON EITHER SIDE, BUT SHOULD ALLOW COLLABORATION OF EFFORT WHERE THE GOALS BENEFIT BOTH. WE ARE AWARE THAT TO DATE, THE GOI HAS PUT MORE EFFORT (SOME ADMITTEDLY WASTED OR MISDIRECTED), INTO DEVELOPING NEW COOPERATIVE PROPOSALS THAN WE HAVE.

4. ON THE QUESTION OF DEFENDING JOINT RESEARCH PROJECTS  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 270212

AGAINST UNFAIR CRITICISM, WE THINK THE GOI HAS ASSUMED RESPONSIBILITY FOR THIS. IN THE AGREED MINUTE OF THE JOINT COMMISSION MEETING SIGNED BY FOREIGN MINISTER CHAVAN, THE GOI AGREED "THAT COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS THAT ARE IMPLEMENTED BY AGREEMENT OF THE TWO GOVERNMENTS MEET THE TEST OF MUTUAL BENEFIT AND ARE FULLY ENDORSED BY BOTH GOVERNMENTS". THE GOI COMMITMENT IS NOT LIMITED TO PROGRAMS SUGGESTED BY THE S AND T SUBCOMMISSION AND WE PRESUME THE

GOI WILL STAND BEHIND ITS WORD SHOULD FUTURE "MOSQUITO" PROBLEMS ARISE. IF NAG CHAUDHURI'S REMARKS INDICATE THAT THE GOI, ITSELF, STANDS ONLY BEHIND "SUBCOMMISSION" PROJECTS, WE COULD HAVE PROBLEMS. HOWEVER, WE THINK IT POSSIBLE THAT NAG CHAUDHURI WAS ADDRESSING ONLY HIS PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND THAT THE APPROPRIATE GOI AGENCIES OR SCREENING BODIES WOULD BE PREPARED TO DEFEND JOINT PROJECTS SHOULD THESE AGAIN COME UNDER ATTACK. IF

YOU FEEL THIS QUESTION REMAINS UNCLEAR, WE ARE READY FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION AT THE UPCOMING S AND T MEETING ALTHOUGH WE THOUGHT THAT THE CAREFULLY DRAFTED LANGUAGE IN THE AGREED MINUTE RESOLVED THE PROBLEM IN A MUTUALLY SATISFACTORY MANNER.

5. WITH REGARD TO RUPEE FUNDED RESEARCH, WE DO NOT WISH THE EMBASSY TO HOLD UP NOTIFICATION OF USG APPROVAL OF NEW PROJECTS TO THE GOI. THESE PROJECTS ARE FORMULATED AND FUNDED BY USG FOR OUR DOMESTIC BENEFIT AND DO NOT REPRESENT A NEW CATEGORY OF INITIATIVES. THEY HAVE BEEN GOING ON FOR MANY YEARS QUITE ROUTINELY. MOREOVER, WE MADE THE RESUMPTION OF GOI APPROVAL OF THESE PROJECTS A CONDITION FOR OUR PROCEEDING WITH THE RUPEE AGREEMENT IN 1974. WE ARE THEREFORE RELUCTANT TO SUSPEND THESE PROGRAMS UNILATERALLY. IF MRS. GANDHI'S WORDS ARE TRANSLATED INTO NEW GOI POLICIES, WE WOULD PREFER TO LET THE INDIANS TAKE ANY INITIATIVE IN BLOCKING THIS FACET OF SCIENCE COOPERATION SO THAT BLAME WILL FALL CLEARLY ON THEIR SHOULDERS. IN SHORT, WE THINK THESE PROGRAMS SHOULD CONTINUE (OF COURSE SUBJECT TO ALL PREVIOUS CAVEATS) UNTIL THE INDIANS MAKE CLEAR BY THEIR ACTIONS THAT THEY WANT THEM TO STOP. THE GOI SCREENING PROCESS, WHICH YOU INDICATE MAY BE REVAMPED, PROVIDES THE INDIANS WITH AMPLE OPPORTUNITY TO

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 270212

SAY "NO" ANYTIME THEY CONCLUDE PROJECTS WE PROPOSE DO NOT FIT INDIAN RESEARCH PRIORITIES. IN THE ABSENCE OF SOME ACTION BY THE GOI, WE WOULD ALSO BE IN A POOR POSITION TO EXPLAIN TO THE CONGRESS WHY WE WERE BLOCKING THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR RUPEE RESEARCH APPROPRIATED THROUGH THE NORMAL CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET. MOREOVER, WE SHOULD NOT LOSE SIGHT OF THE FACT THAT U.S. AGENCIES ARE MEETING THEIR OWN DOMESTIC CRITERIA AND PURPOSES IN FUNDING THESE PROGRAMS. WE ARE, HOWEVER, CONCERNED BY MRS. GANDHI'S REFERENCE TO GIUNEA PIGS SINCE IT LENDS CREDENCE TO THE PAC ATTACK ON THE MOSQUITO PROJECT. IN THIS REGARD, WE ARE STILL LOOKING FOR THE PROMISED MINISTRY OF HEALTH STATEMENT. WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE RECORD HERE SET STRAIGHT AND THE BOOK CLOSED BEFORE THE NEXT S&T SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING. IF NOT IT MAY BE NECESSARY TO RAISE

THE QUESTION AGAIN WITH INDIANS AT THAT TIME. KISSINGER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 14 NOV 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** KelleyW0  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975STATE270212  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** RBMORLEY/DKUX:EI  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750398-0974  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19751145/aaaaboat.tel  
**Line Count:** 170  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ORIGIN NEA  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 75 NEW DELHI 14387  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** KelleyW0  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 06 AUG 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <06 AUG 2003 by CunninFX>; APPROVED <25 NOV 2003 by KelleyW0>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** SCIENCE COOPERATION WITH THE INDIANS: S & T SUB- COMMISSION AND RUPEE-SUPPORT RESEARCH  
**TAGS:** TECH, IN, US, USINJC  
**To:** NEW DELHI  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006